



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Never, indeed, were the prospects of our cause more encouraging, on the whole, than now; and all we need to insure for it a steadily increasing success under God, is the fidelity of its friends in using the means He has appointed for such a result. Let them use these means aright; let them keep the question before the mass of the people; let them enlist everywhere the pulpit and the press, the school-room and the fireside; let them set the myriads so long cursed with the mighty evils of this custom, to thinking, and reading, and talking on the subject; let them pour all over Christendom a ceaseless flood of facts, arguments and appeals to illustrate and enforce the claims of this cause; and we cannot for a moment doubt its steady progress in due time to a sure and glorious triumph.

What we have to do for this cause, however, must be done quickly. At our last anniversary we mourned the loss of our venerable friend Dr. MERRILL, in whose place, as one of our Vice-Presidents, we elected a man of sweet Christian spirit, a very embodiment of the spirit of peace, like "the beloved disciple," JOSEPH P. FAIRBANKS, of St. Johnsbury, Vt.; but we soon learned that, at the very time of his appointment to the office, his Master had just called him to the peace-maker's reward on high. During the winter one of our most estimable coadjutors, the Secretary of the R. I. Peace Society, JOHN H. HAMLIN, of Providence, was suddenly taken away in the midst of a very useful life. Later still, JASPER COPE, of Philadelphia, for many years a steadfast and liberal supporter of our cause, and from whose estate it has received since his death a legacy of \$250, went in his eighty-fourth year, calmly to his rest while at worship in the house of God. And finally a most excellent and venerable friend of our cause, ripe alike in years and in Christian worth, one in the line of descent from the famous warrior-patriot of revolutionary memory, DAVID PUTNAM, of Marietta, Ohio, died at the great age of eighty-eight. Some others, more immediately engaged in our service, have received very distinct warning, that "the night cometh when no man can work" any more in this or any other cause of God and man.

LESSONS FROM THE RECENT WAR.

SUPPLEMENT TO THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY'S REPORT.

MEN seldom learn wisdom except from the recoil of their own follies; and it is well if they can be effectually taught even by these. The war just closed is well fitted to impress such lessons of warning as ought henceforth to dissuade the nations from their immemorial, suicidal practice of appealing to arms for the settlement of their disputes. Now, if ever, is the time to collect and enforce these lessons; and we hope the most effectual means possible will be taken to make the conflict in the Crimea the last great war of Christendom.

Just glance at a few of its bitter lessons. *How USELESS does it prove the whole practice of War!* Some good must, of course, come from it, for no evil is entirely unmixed; but we challenge any advocate of the custom to

show us a single benefit that might not have been secured quite as well without this war as with it. All its waste of treasure and havoc of life, its crimes and atrocities, its privations, anguish and sufferings, its wide and fearful sweep of domestic agony over a continent, the moral virus it has diffused more or less through the world, its temporary blight on the general interests of mankind in every land, have nearly all been a dead loss, a mass of evil compensated by no good that might not have been attained far better without its guilty agency.

Such is the usual progress and upshot of war—a series of desperate struggles to see which can inflict or bear the most evil, until the parties, weary of the work of mutual mischief, conclude to stop fighting, and agree, by negotiation or reference, to leave matters as nearly as possible where they were before the contest began. Such is an outline of nine wars in ten; such has it been in the case now before us; and such must generally be the result of war among all civilized nations.

It may well seem amazing that such a war should have occurred in such an age as our own, among nations reputedly Christian, and having so vast an amount of common interests at stake. How can we account for it? Only by supposing the nations of Christendom to have been all along relying for security against war upon means that are found on trial to precipitate the very catastrophe they were designed to prevent. What are these reliances? The chief of them all is Power—the power of wealth, numbers and skill, of fleets and armies. On these do governments now, as ever, depend for security against war; and what has been the result? The nations of antiquity, engaged most frequently in war, were notoriously the most powerful. So also in modern times. From 1700 to the overthrow of Napoleon in 1815, a period of one hundred and fifteen years, Great Britain spent sixty-nine years, more than one half the whole time, in actual war, Russia sixty-eight years, France sixty-three, Holland fifty-three, Denmark only twenty-eight, and other countries in like ratio; their wars, as a general rule, very much in proportion to their military strength. So in the case before us; for the parties to this conflict were the largest and mightiest powers in the world, and doubtless embarked in it very much because they felt themselves so able to bear and to inflict its evils.

Another false security against war is the theory of *the Balance of Power*. A beautiful idea, but, as a preventive of war, a sheer delusion, a suicidal resort. The most plausible pretext for the recent war was the necessity of preserving this balance of power. Such was its avowed object and chief justification. The Allies, as self-constituted guardians of this fancied equilibrium, set themselves to the task of crippling or crushing a power dangerous in their view to the rights, repose and welfare of the civilized world; and thus did this alleged conservator of peace plunge more than half Europe into one of the most terrible wars ever known.

Still worse is the theory of *preparation for war as a means of preventing it*. On this principle, Europe is wont, even in a time of peace, to keep some three millions of men under arms, occasionally increased to some four mil-

lions or more, at an expense of nearly one thousand million dollars a year. What is the result? These preparations for war just provoke it; and the danger there arises more from such preparations than from any other cause. Such *must* be their effect; because preparation for any deed temp's of course to its commission. So we all reason in like cases. Would you train men for duelling or gambling, for robbery or murder, just to prevent those crimes, or multiply grog-shops or brothels as so many antidotes to intemperance? Never; and equally does common sense decide that preparations for war, like preparation for any thing else, are so many provocatives to war. So all history teaches. Had the parties to this war in the Crimea been entirely unprepared for it, would they have gone into it so readily? Thus do the armies of Europe probably occasion far more wars than they prevent; and, could the nations of Christendom be brought to a simultaneous abandonment of all such preparations, or a proportionate reduction of them down to a force sufficient barely for an internal police, such a measure would do much, far more than standing armies ever did or can, to ensure permanent peace.

Even more futile is the *hope of peace from improvements in the art of war*. We occasionally find men relying on such improvements, in the belief that whatever makes the strife of nations more surely and more terribly destructive, must tend to hold them back from the sword, and induce them in time to discard it altogether. A suicidal fallacy; for does the most expert gamester gamble the least, or the most accomplished forger forge the least? Who fights the greatest number of duels—the man who never pulled a trigger in his life, or the dead-shot, as the practised duellist is called, who has learned by long experience to put a ball from a rifle or pistol in the same bullet-hole nine times out of ten? For ages has the best practical talent in Christendom been employed in perfecting the implements and tactics of war; but of what avail have all these infernal improvements proved to deter its nations from the terrible scenes of the Crimea? Improvements in the art of war prevent its recurrence, or mitigate its evils! The supposition is absurd, and contradicted by all experience. We might as well think to prevent wickedness by multiplying facilities for its commission! No perfection in the art or the instruments of war, no war-steamers, no explosive torpedoes, no Congreve rockets, or Colt revolvers, no Minnie rifles, no Paixhans or Lancaster guns, can ever suffice either to avert war, or to mitigate in the least its atrocities and horrors.

How ineffectual, too, *the motive of self-interest* on which many are wont to rely with so much confidence! A late monarch of Europe was wont to say, that 'war now costs so much that nations can no longer afford it;' but before the whirlwind of mad and reckless excitements that usually attend the rise of war, such motives are swept away like chaff before a tempest. Did not the parties to the recent contest know well, before it came, that it would inevitably inflict upon every one of them a vast amount of mischief and misery, the very evils it has actually occasioned? Did the dread of such evils hold them back from the fierce and terrible strife? And can we expect any fear of like results to prevent future wars

Indeed, how little confidence can we put upon *any* of the ordinary safeguards against war. Shall we rely on popular government, and a general diffusion of intelligence? The late war came in response to a strong demand for it, against the cooler judgment of their rulers, from the freest and most enlightened people in Europe. Shall we trust for security to an unfettered press and an unmuzzled pulpit? The pulpits and presses of England, as free as any in the world, clamored in a chorus for the late war, and continued their clamors with little abatement to the last. Can we rely any better on the stereotyped distinction between offensive and defensive wars? The very plea of every party to the war just closed; they all deemed it strictly defensive, each on their own side! Russia reluctantly drew the sword merely in vindication of her rights long guaranteed by solemn treaties; Turkey, of course, in defense of her menaced integrity and independence; France and England for the protection, not only of their ally, but of the civilized world, against an overgrown, unscrupulous, all-grasping power. It was sheer self-defense on all sides! Was there ever any other sort of war in the estimation of its abettors? Our last war with England was strictly defensive on both sides; for we declared it only in vindication of our rights, and she merely repelled our assaults! So in our war against Mexico, we went more than a hundred miles beyond our own territory, in quest of Mexicans to fight, and then slaughtered them all the way to their capitol—in sheer self-defense!! Thus has France sent forth her troops by wholesale into Africa, and England hers into China, India and Caffraria, in search of enemies to slay—in pure self-defense! The great practical lie of Christendom, the devil's master-device for deluding its nations into blood. There never was a more arrant and barefaced falsehood. Napoleon himself, the remorseless ravager of a continent for his own selfish ends, solemnly declared on his death-bed, that he had never fought except in strict self-defense!! And is all this mere pretence, utter hypocrisy? No; each party set up a claim which they deem just; and the enforcement of such a claim by sword is called a war of self-defense. Such is the common mode of reasoning; and thus every war becomes of course defensive on each side, because in defense of what both parties alike claim as their right. You cannot find in all modern history a single war that was not, in this view, defensive on both sides; and thus would the common logic on this subject overwhelm the world with inevitable and interminable wars of strict self-defense!

But can we find no security against war in the *Christian sentiment of Christendom*? There ought to be, but there is not in fact; for the mass even of professed Christians have been for ages trained to the common modes of thought and feeling on this subject, and even now betray as a body few, if any, principles of peace strictly *peculiar* to the gospel. They reason about it very much as men of the world do, just as we might suppose an enlightened, fair-minded pagan would in the meridian of the nineteenth century. They appear on this subject very much as if no Prince of Peace had come, as if no angel choir had ever chanted their song of peace at his birth, as if his sermon on the mount had never been preached. There is not one Christian in ten, if

one in a hundred, that seems ever to have made an earnest or very special application of the gospel to the case. The result is inevitable; the current Christianity is in fact no sure safeguard against this master-evil. The public opinion of Christendom, in the Church as well as out of it, upholds the custom, and not only tolerates, but enjoins the practice of occasionally resorting to the brutal arbitrament of the sword. There is on this question little to distinguish one form of Christianity from another; they are nearly all active, undisguised supporters of the war-system. Look at the illustration of their respective views in the late war. Russia, as head of the Greek Church, France as representative of Popery, and England as champion of Protestantism, Greek, Papist and Protestant, all united in regarding the war, each on their own side, as right and Christian, perfectly consistent with their views of the gospel, part and parcel of their religion! Can such views of Christianity, such an application of the gospel, ever put an end to this custom, or suffice as any reliable safeguard against its actual recurrence?

Has the gospel, then, no power to abolish or prevent war? Yes, power amply sufficient for the purpose. The fault is not in the gospel, but in its professed friends. Its pacific principles, if rightly applied, would be sure, in due time to abolish war, all war; but these principles the mass of Christians have for long ages either openly discarded, or silently ignored, and thus neutralized their power by denying them a fair opportunity to do away this great sin and scourge. The gospel is God's sovereign remedy for war; but it must of course be rightly applied, before it can cure this evil, or any other. Who shall thus apply it for this purpose? Christians must; for none but Christians, real disciples of the Prince of Peace, ever will, or ever can. But how shall *they* apply it? By first imbuing their own hearts fully with its spirit, and then diffusing this spirit all around them in the family, in the school, in the church, through every ramification of society, until the principles of the gospel on this subject shall be permanently woven in the habits and usages of every Christian community. Let this be done; and the custom of war must cease from Christendom just as fast as the laws of the human mind will permit such a consummation. To this result all our efforts are aimed; and in this great work we would fain enlist the leading influences of the Christian world.

How clearly, moreover, has this war shown the custom to be essentially the same it ever was! Some have apparently supposed that men, especially in Christendom, must be at length so enlightened and christianized, that war, if it *must* come, would prove comparatively mild, merciful and harmless. A sad and utter mistake; for we have found war, this very war, beneath the meridian blaze of the nineteenth century, among nations calling themselves Christians, to be the same savage, brutal business it ever was; the same privations, hardships and sufferings, the same cruelties and crimes, the same atrocities and horrors. So indeed it must be from its very nature; and no degree of civilization, no form of Christianity itself that shall tolerate the custom, can ever suffice to alter its immemorial character, or materially diminish its abominations and woes

Yet has this war seemed to develop more than ever the real brotherhood of the human race. They are in truth, as God ever meant they should be, one great family, no member of which can suffer without affecting, more or less, the whole; and from this interlinking of interests, by commerce and other means of intercourse, a single campaign may now send a malign influence over the four quarters of the globe. The struggle in the Crimea was constantly felt, not only in the marts and work-shops of all Europe, but in every city and village of our own land — on its chief departments of business, on every bank and warehouse, on the ship-yards of the North, and the cotton-fields of the South, on the foundries and forges of Pennsylvania, on the railways of the East and the West, on the spindles of Lowell and Lawrence, in the mansions of the rich, in the hovels and garrets of the poor. It has made the whole world a sufferer. Well did the leading journal of Europe say during the war, “the people, the many-handed, the many-mouthed people of England, will have this year to pay some thirty-seven per cent. more for their bread than they did last year;” an average increase of more than thirty-five dollars a year for every family of five persons; an estimate applicable to nearly the whole civilized world, and proving the war to have been upon the people a virtual tax of hundreds and even thousands of millions of dollars upon the necessities of life. A fearful ubiquity of mischief, but inseparable from any war, and making it in every case a question of deep interest for all to avert so wide and terrible a calamity.

How strikingly, too, has this war illustrated the folly of relying on the sword as a pioneer and champion of liberty! Many a generous mind hailed it as a harbinger of deliverance from the long-oppressed nationalities of Europe. Such an idea was the offspring of a noble wish, but still an utter and fatal delusion. Such interests can take sure or safe root in no soil but that of peace, and can there ripen into a beneficent maturity only under its genial influences. For such a plant there must be a fitting soil, the soil of general intelligence and virtue. Popular government must, as in our own case, be rooted deep in the character of a people, in their habits of self-control, and spontaneous obedience to law; habits that require long peaceful ages fully to form and fix. If unfit for such a government, freedom itself would be a curse; but, if well trained for it, they must and will, in God’s time, be free like our own forefathers. Without such training, no efforts for freedom have ever proved permanently successful. How often has the experiment been tried, and signally failed! France tried it first near the close of the last century, but soon plunged into a wild, ferocious anarchy from which she was glad at length to find refuge even in a stern, relentless despotism. A third time she tried it, and again threw herself into imperial arms for protection. So have the spasmodic struggles of the people in other countries of the Old World for their rights by violence, undoubtedly put back the cause of liberty for ages. And still they cling to the sword as their chief hope! Strange infatuation that can dream of freedom to a continent as a result of war! They promised liberty from the war of the Crimea as the chief argument for it in England and

here; but it has left the masses of Europe more prostrate than ever under the heel of despotic power, and thus proved, if anything could, that liberty has in truth little to hope from the sword. A single century of unbroken peace would do far more for freedom, than would a thousand years of the most successful fighting; and its friends, whether they will or not, must in time learn to wait God's slow but sure method of working out the people's deliverance from oppression by such moral influences as can thrive only in the sunshine of peace.

SOME EXTRACTS FROM REPORTS OF AGENTS.

REV. A. C. HAND.

In addition to my regular reports from quarter to quarter, I subjoin a brief statement of the kind and quantity of labor bestowed, and the reception with which your agent has been greeted in different localities, together with some of the objections he has been called to answer.

1. As to the kind of labor bestowed, I would say, that very little has been attempted in public, except by regular peace sermons delivered generally at regular hours of public service in the churches. Sometimes, a union of different congregations has been effected in the afternoon or evening with good result. Sometimes cards and pencils have been circulated at the conclusion with good success; and sometimes we have depended altogether on private applications at the people's residences or places of business. Generally more or less can be raised by private applications even after a successful public collection. Very little can be accomplished in the West on week days, excepting by visiting, shop-lectures, fire-side preaching, and distributing peace publications.

2. The quantity of labor bestowed has been less than the extent and importance of the field might well have required; but not perhaps when the physical ability of the agent, and the state of the weather, roads, etc., are considered. Last year, and the first part of the present, it was nothing strange for me to preach three times to as many congregations on a Sabbath, and sometimes ride from three to eight miles between them. I have since last July restricted myself to two, excepting, I believe, in one instance. This may account, in part, for the fact that my collections are \$105,73 less than last year, notwithstanding the present year has been larger by one month.

3. The reception I have met, has been, from reformatory and progressive men, cordial: from conservative men, cool and cautious; and from confirmed, incurable conservatives, repulsive. In many instances I have been permitted, with a good degree of cordiality, to occupy the best hour of the day in the churches; in others a second best, and in others, some hour when there was no stated service, lest an irrelevant, secular or political theme should disturb the solemn services of the sanctuary!

I visited Madison when the people were in the highest state of excitement, Gov. Barstow having just threatened the use of all the power at his command to vindicate his claims; and when the Kansas excitement was also running high. After considerable consultation, it was concluded to get up a union meeting at the Baptist church in the evening. During the day the appointment was announced in the different churches, that in the evening the claims of the Peace cause would be presented, and the application of